

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office action dated November 5, 2003. In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurple in view of Gaskill; claims 2-6, 15-18 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurple and Gaskill in further view of Youngberg; claims 7-12, 20-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurple in view Evans; and claims 13, 25 and 26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurple and Evans in further view of Gildewell et al. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and traverses all rejections, but has amended the claims as explained below to more clearly recite the present invention and distinguish over the cited references.

The present invention, as more clearly described for example in claim 1 as amended herein, is a security system that includes a portable, wrist-wearable timepiece. The timepiece has a timekeeping circuit for calculating a time of day and for generating a time indicating signal representing the time of day. The timepiece also has a wireless transmitter means for transmitting data signals that include a time reset signal generated by the timekeeping circuit (the time reset signal does not include the actual time of day information). The timepiece also has processing means that are adapted to cause the transmitter means to transmit the time reset signal at the same predetermined time every day (such as 12:00 AM).

The invention also includes a control panel that has a clock function, a wireless receiver in communication with the control panel for receiving the time reset signal from the wireless transmitting means, and sensor devices in communication with the control panel. The control panel is adapted to reset the clock function to the same predetermined time as in the timepiece on the receipt of the time reset signal from the timepiece that is received via the wireless receiver. As a result, the timepiece and the control panel are in time synchronization at the same time every day (e.g. 12:00 AM) without having to exchange time of day information.

Support for this amendment may be found at page 9, lines 11-26. Thus, no new matter has been added.

The Examiner admits in the Office action that Kurple does not disclose means for time synchronization between the transmitter and receiver, but alleges that time synchronization between a wrist worn timepiece and a remote device by means of wireless signals is well known and disclosed in Gaskill (notably column 7, line 10). The Examiner also alleges that Youngberg teaches transmission of time synchronization data between remote devices at a predetermined time, in response to manual actuation or after a predetermined event (column 4, lines 48-58).

Gaskill teaches that a personal communication device (PCD) and a second device may exchange information including time of day information, which can be used by the device receiving the information in resetting its internal time of day clock (col. 1, line 65 - col. 2, line 3).

Gaskill further explains that "the time of day information exchanged by the PCD 20 and the personal computer 40 would include the time and a number signifying its degree of accuracy" (col. 7, lines 31-33). Moreover,

[i]n reconciling the exchanged time of day information, the personal computer 40 and the PCD preferably use the degree of accuracy information to select whether to reset their internal clocks to match the time of day received from the other. If the time of day received in the communication session has a higher degree of accuracy than its internal real-time clock 22, then the PCD 20 would update its clock to match the received time.

Col. 7, lines 54-61 (emphasis added).

Therefore, the system of Gaskill requires that the transmitting device send the actual time of day information and that the receiving device change its time of day to that which was received from the transmitting device. In contrast, the system in amended claim 1 requires merely that a time reset signal be sent at the same predetermined time each day (e.g. 12:00 AM), and that the control panel will then reset itself to that same predetermined time. This functions as a reset function, with the time being reset to a known time, rather than requiring the actual time of day information be sent as in Gaskill.

Youngberg also does not teach that a time reset signal is sent at the same predetermined time each day, and that the control panel will then reset itself to that same predetermined time. Youngberg teaches that time information is exchanged between a master clock and a slave clock and "loaded into internal clock registers" (col. 7,

lines 21-22). Youngberg also teaches that the master clock sends information to the slave clocks when a periodic event occurs, such as an internal timer overflow), or when a random event occurs (such as a human pushing a button or a power outage occurring). In any of these events, the actual time that the time information is being exchanged may vary (i.e. it is not predetermined), and thus the actual time information must be sent to the slave clock for "loading into the internal clock registers". Youngberg does not teach or suggest the use of a reset function, with the time being reset to a known time, rather than requiring the actual time of day information be sent, as in the amended claim 1.

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over each and all of the prior art references cited by the Examiner. Claims 2 and 3 were cancelled (their subject matter being incorporated into claim 1 with clarifications as explained above). Claims 4 - 13, as amended herein, all depend from claim 1 and are also patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 14 is a method-type claim with limitations similar in scope to amended claim 1 and is also patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Claims 15 and 16 have been cancelled (their subject matter being incorporated into claim 14 with clarifications as explained above). Claims 17 - 26 as amended herein, all depend from claim 14 and are also patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Applicant thus submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, early notice of which would be appreciated. Should the Examiner not agree with the Applicants' position, a personal or telephonic interview is respectfully requested to discuss any remaining issues and expedite the eventual allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 3/5, 2004

Anthony R. Barkume
Reg. No. 33,831
Attorney for Applicant

20 Gateway Lane
Manorville, NY 11949
tel (631) 878-0526
fax (631) 980-7997
tony@barkume.com